

REMARKS

The Official Action of January 4, 2005, and the prior art cited and relied upon therein have been carefully studied. The claims in the application are now claims 1 and 4-6, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Favorable reconsideration and such allowance are respectfully urged.

Claims 2 and 3 have been canceled and new claim 6 added. Claims 1 and 4-6 remain in the application for consideration.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5 as being unpatentable over Lai '974 in view of Susoev '800. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, especially as applied to claim 1 as amended and new independent claim 4.

Applicant submits that neither Lai nor Susoev teach forming a knot larger than the gate of a lift lock on a lift cord of a Venetian blind in the same manner claimed by Applicant. The forming of the claimed knots both simplifies their creation and facilitates their speedy placement along a respective lift cord beyond that cited by the cited prior art.

Acknowledgement by the PTO of the receipt of applicants' papers filed under Section 119 is noted.

Appln. No. 10/780,562  
Amdt. dated April 4, 2005  
Reply to Office Action dated Jan. 4, 2005

The prior art documents made of record and not relied upon have been noted along with the implication that such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently pertinent to warrant their applications against any of applicant's claims.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By N-12  
Norman J. Latker  
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma  
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528  
G:\bn\d\dire\nien36\pto\Amendment-A.doc